

## **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone conference of April 27, 2004. The Examiner had indicated that claims 1 and 14 would potentially be allowable if they included limitations regarding the compression and decompression aspects of current claim 10 and that claims 1, 10 and 14 may also be allowable if amended to state that the computer system uses the multiple video adapters to display information on multiple display devices. Applicants have added new claim 21 for examination which indicates that the computer system uses at least multiple video adapters to display information on multiple display devices in addition to the BIOS storing methodology set forth in claim 1 and is therefore allowable for the reasons set forth below. Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for the suggestions but upon examination of the cited reference, believe that the claims in their current form are in condition for allowance without further amendment other than the typographical corrections made below.

Claims 10-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention due to typographical errors. Applicants have corrected these claims and accordingly respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

A new ground of rejection has been applied to pending claims 1-20. Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 6, 622,200 (Hasbun et al.). The office

action admits that the admitted prior art does not teach the claimed mechanism and processes of storing the BIOSs associated with a plurality of different video adapters used for operating a plurality of display devices in the manner claimed. The Hasbun reference has been cited as allegedly teaching this operation.

For example, as to claim 1, the office action cites Hasbun, column 16, lines 11-16 and column 25, lines 45-62. However, it appears that the office action fails to take into account specific claim language required by the claim and also appears to combine different teachings in the reference such as some teachings with respect to a reallocation process and a reclamation process. In any event, as Applicants will show below that the cited reference fails to teach or suggest the claimed subject matter.

The cited portion of Hasbun relating to column 16 is directed to a reallocation technique which provides for the ability to maintain a copy of the original object while the original is being replaced and then deleting the original object from memory completely. (See for example column 15, lines 50-52). As noted in column 16, when reallocation occurs, pointers to object locations are used. Moreover, after an object has been copied, it is erased. A write of a second object, such as an updated version is then written to the location of the first object (the erased location). However in addition, “If the reallocation process has proceeded without interruption, the duplicate of the first object is invalidated...” (column 16, lines 16-18). As such, Hasbun teaches copying an object to a different location, erasing the original of the object, storing a new object in the erased portion and deleting the copy that was made since it is not required as the new object is the only object used. In contrast, Applicants claim not only performing certain BIOS storing steps in response to whether a first video adapter is a secondary video

adapter and the second video adapter is the primary video adapter, which also is not disclosed or taught in the cited reference, but also does not delete the copied BIOS as required by the Hasbun reference in the cited portion. Hasbun teaches an opposite approach from that claimed and the claim is in condition for allowance.

Moreover, the claim requires that the video driver for the first adapter copies the first video BIOS from the second memory to a third memory area in the memory system. As such as claimed, the first BIOS is overwritten, copied and copied again. In other words, it is copied two times, in one example, since it is maintained and not deleted. The Hasbun reference teaches an entirely different approach. Moreover, the cited portion in column 25 of the reference does not refer to the reallocation process in column 16 but instead refers to a reclamation process. The reclamation process appears to merely be a repositioning of information to save memory. There is no teaching or suggestion in connection with multiple video adapters to have a video driver for a first video adapter copy a first video BIOS from a second memory to a third memory in a system memory as required. Accordingly, the claim is also in condition for allowance for this reason.

Applicants respectfully submit the above remarks with reference to independent claims 10 and 14 and as such these claims are also in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims also add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.


In addition, as to claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that the references do not appear to teach or suggest system BIOS structure to decompress the first video BIOS and storing the decompressed first video BIOS in system memory and copying the decompressed first video BIOS to a second memory and thereafter to store the second video BIOS in the first memory area thereby overwriting the first video BIOS in the first

memory area. These claim limitations also do not appear to be addressed in the office action, particularly with respect to the decompression aspect in combination with the other BIOS copying and storing technique.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will expedite the prosecution of the application.

Dated: Aug. 4, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder Price Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
PHONE: (312) 609-7599  
FAX: (312) 609-5005